

**REMARKS**

This paper is responsive to the non-final Office Action dated October 23, 2002, having a shortened statutory period set to expire on January 23, 2003 in which,

Claims 1-56 were pending; and

Claims 1-56 have been rejected.

No claims have been amended, cancelled, or added by this response.

**Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102**

In the present Office Action, Claims 1-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,408,518, issued to Yunoki (hereinafter, "*Yunoki*"). While not conceding that the cited reference qualifies as prior art, but instead to expedite prosecution, Applicants have chosen to traverse the claim rejections as follows. The following arguments are made without prejudice to Applicants' right to establish, for example in a continuing application, that the cited reference does not qualify as prior art with respect to an invention embodiment currently or subsequently claimed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference, *Yunoki*, fails to teach, show or suggest all elements of Applicants' claims. More specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that *Yunoki* fails to teach, show, or suggest a method for adding a network station client to an ongoing conference call, comprising:

extending a persistent invitation to a first network station client to join a conference call in response to a determination that the first network station client is unavailable to accept a non-persistent invitation to join the conference call;

as required by Applicants' claim 1.

Regarding Applicants' claim 1, the present Office Action states that,

Yunoki teaches and describes a system and method for adding a network station client to an ongoing conference call, comprising:

-extending a persistent invitation to a first network station client to join a conference call in response to a determination that the first network station client is unavailable to accept a non-persistent invitation to join the conference call (Fig. 1, col. 4 line 30 to line 61)

Applicants respectfully disagree. *Yunoki* teaches a service control point (SCP) including a teleconference executor and a teleconference registerer comprising a teleconference reservation notifier, a teleconference status confirmers, and a teleconference absence notifier. According to the cited portion of *Yunoki*,

The teleconference reservation notifier registers in a database, the participants's names and the date and time of a teleconference run dictated by a terminal (used by a teleconference sponsor) among the group of terminals 5. It also notifies respective teleconference participants of a teleconference run, has the VRE unit 3 record voice messages of the teleconference sponsor, and sends the voice messages to other participants. In addition, in the event of a teleconference cancellation, on receiving a cancellation request from the teleconference sponsor, it notifies all the teleconference participants of the teleconference cancellation and deletes corresponding teleconference data from the database.

The teleconference status confirmers notifies the teleconference sponsor or a teleconference participant e.g. of the date and time of a teleconference run, in response to an inquiry. A user can obtain the teleconference data by specifying a teleconference ID.

The teleconference absence notifier notifies other teleconference participants of a subscriber's absence from the teleconference and deletes his name from the database, on receiving an absentee's request for an absence notification.

A teleconference executor 8, also provided in the SCP 6, calls up respective teleconference participants on the date and time of the teleconference run registered in the database and connects their terminals online, thereby holding the teleconference. (*Yunoki*, Column 4, Lines 34-61, emphasis supplied)

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portion of *Yunoki* fails to teach, show, or suggest "persistent" and "non-persistent" invitations and/or extending any invitation to join a conference call to a network station client in response to a determination that the network station client is unavailable as claimed (Applicants' claim 1). Rather, as clearly shown above, the cited portion of *Yunoki* teaches the deletion of a subscriber from a teleconference and notification of teleconference participants of the

deleted subscriber's absence from the teleconference on receiving an absentee's request for an absence notification. Applicants therefore submit that *Yunoki* fails to teach, show, or suggest a method for adding a network station client to an ongoing conference call, comprising "extending a persistent invitation to a first network station client to join a conference call in response to a determination that the first network station client is unavailable to accept a non-persistent invitation to join the conference call" as claimed (Applicants' claim 1, emphasis supplied) and that Applicants' claim 1 is consequently allowable over *Yunoki*.

Applicants' claims 2-10 depend from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least those reason(s) stated for the allowability of claim 1. Applicants' claims 11, 24, and 39 include one or more limitations substantially similar to those described with respect to Applicants' claim 1 and therefore those claims and all remaining dependent claims are similarly allowable for at least those reason(s).

Applicants further respectfully submit that the cited reference, *Yunoki*, independently fails to teach, show or suggest all elements of Applicants' claims 2, 4, 5, 8, and 9.

Regarding Applicants' claim 2, the present Office Action states that, *Yunoki* teaches and describes a system and method comprising:

Directing a token generator to issue the persistent invitation to the first network station client in response to user input to a second network station client (Fig. 5, col. 14 line 35 to col. 16 line 67);

Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants are unable to determine what, within the cited portion of *Yunoki*, is intended to be indicated as "directing a token generator to issue the persistent invention" as claimed (Applicants' claim 2) and respectfully request that that portion of *Yunoki* which the Examiner believes teaches, shows, or suggests "directing a token generator to issue the persistent invention" be cited more specifically so that Applicants may respond to the Examiner's rejection.

Regarding Applicants' claim 4, the present Office Action states that, *Yunoki* teaches and describes a system and method comprising:

Determining that the first network station client is not responding to the non-persistent invitation to join the conference call within a specified time period (col. 3 line 6 to line 29);

Applicants respectfully disagree. The cited portion of *Yunoki* teaches that, "in the event of a teleconference cancellation, the teleconference reservation notifier notifies respective participants of the teleconference cancellation on receiving a cancellation request from the teleconference sponsor, and deletes the teleconference data from the database" but fails to teach, show, or suggest however, "determining that the first network station client is not responding to the non-persistent invitation to join...within a specified time period" as claimed by Applicants. (Applicants' claim 4)

Regarding Applicants' claim 5, the present Office Action states that, *Yunoki* teaches and describes a system and method comprising:

sending to the first network station client a token having at least one field selected from the group comprising a token ID field, a conference ID field, a password field, an expiration time field, and a conference call participant information field (Fig. 5, col. 14 line 35 to col. 16 line 67);

Applicants respectfully disagree. As previously described herein with respect to the rejection of Applicants' claim 2, Applicants are unable to determine what, within the cited portion of *Yunoki*, is intended to be indicated as "sending to the first network station client a token" as claimed (Applicants' claim 5) and respectfully request that that portion of *Yunoki* which the Examiner believes teaches, shows, or suggests "sending to the first network station client a token" be cited more specifically so that Applicants may respond to the Examiner's rejection.

Regarding Applicants' claim 8, the present Office Action states that, *Yunoki* teaches and describes a system and method comprising:

withdrawing the persistent invitation upon termination of the conference call (col. 22 line 53 to 59);

Applicants respectfully disagree. The cited portion of *Yunoki*, described with respect to Figure 9 of *Yunoki* showing "the sequence of a teleconference status confirmation process" teaches that, "At the end of terminating the notification, the mapper 27 sends to the SCP 21 an "ANNOUNCEMENT RESPONSE" message, thereby allowing the SCP 21 to complete its process" but fails to teach, show, or suggest, "withdrawing" any invitation, persistent or otherwise.

Moreover, Applicants submit that the described "terminating" within the cited portion of *Yunoki* is of a notification which occurs when, "The VRE unit 25 notifies teleconference participant 42 of the teleconference ID and the date and time of the teleconference run" (*Yunoki*, Column 22, Lines 50-52). Consequently, Applicants additionally submit that the cited portion of *Yunoki* fails to teach, show, or suggest, withdrawing the persistent invitation, "upon termination of the conference call" as required by Applicants' claim. (Applicants' claim 8, emphasis supplied)

Regarding Applicants' claim 9, the present Office Action states that, *Yunoki* teaches and describes a system and method comprising:

notifying the first network station client that the conference call has been terminated (col. 22 line 53 to 59);

Applicants respectfully disagree. As previously described herein with respect to the rejection of Applicants' claim 8, Applicants submit that in the cited portion of *Yunoki*, the described "terminating" is not of a conference call (see *Yunoki*, Column 22, Lines 50-52). Accordingly, Applicants submit that the cited portion of *Yunoki* fails to teach, show, or suggest, notifying the first network station client that "the conference call has been terminated" as claimed (Applicants' claim 9, emphasis supplied).

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5097.


I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Box: Non-Fee Amendment, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, Washington, D.C. 20231, on January 23, 2003.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

1-23-03  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Justin M. Dillon  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 42,486  
(512) 439-5097 [Phone]  
(512) 439-5099 [Fax]